

convention, or the action of the people voting at primary elections, to have bearing or influence on him. Every man elected to a state legislature, or to any similar body, is invested with a large degree of personal responsibility and personal discretion. His accounting must be with the constituency which elected him. A senator or representative in the general assembly of Ohio from Hamilton county, when he votes for United States senator, is responsible to himself and his constituents of Hamilton county. The instructions of some fellow who is able to handle a state convention should be of no account to him.

So, according to The Enquirer, even though the men who nominate a legislative candidate at a primary instruct him on the senatorial question, he is not bound thereby. The Enquirer goes so far as to say that "if a man is decently qualified for public life he will not allow the 'instructions' of a state convention, or the action of the people voting at primary elections, to have bearing or influence upon him."

This is not democratic, and it is doubtful whether any republican would admit that it is republican. It is autocratic and plutocratic. The theory that the people elect a man to do their thinking for them and then invest him with "a large degree of personal responsibility and personal discretion" that the people themselves cannot direct or control, is entirely antagonistic to our principles of government. The people do not elect representatives to think for them but to act for them, and nearly all of the evils in our government come from a failure of representatives to carry out the wishes of their constituents. It is not enough that a man shall be "responsible" to his constituents, for the trusts are in a position to make any senator independent who will do their bidding. Government would soon be a mockery if the people had no right to direct or instruct their representatives. What is a platform for except to instruct representatives? According to the theory advanced by The Enquirer, either there ought to be no platform or a platform is not binding upon those who are elected upon it.

The Enquirer's situation is a pitiful one and it is another illustration of the truth that is really too evident to need illustration, namely,—that when an editor departs from democratic principles he heads directly and irresistibly toward the aristocratic position that rests upon a contempt for both the rights and the intelligence of the people. Comparatively few republican papers would quote with approval what the Enquirer says in the discussion of governmental principles. The Enquirer has fallen to a depth where it has but little company.

#### CARNEGIE'S NEW SUBSIDY

Andrew Carnegie, in his effort to get rid of his wealth, has stumbled upon one of the most successful plans for subsidizing public opinion yet discovered. He has set apart ten millions in steel trust bonds as a fund for the aid of superannuated college professors. The income will amount to \$500,000 a year and this will furnish an annuity of five hundred dollars to one thousand teachers, or an annuity of one thousand dollars to five hundred. He has named the presidents of some twenty-five of the largest private colleges as trustees of the fund. What will be the influence of this fund?

First, the trustees can not well denounce the steel trust while they administer a fund drawn annually from the treasury of the trust, and their silence will have its influence upon the subordinate teachers in those colleges. What will it mean to have the leading colleges in the country made silent partners with a great monopoly? It tends to paralyze the educational work which the colleges ought to be doing.

What will be the influence of the prospective annuities on the thousands of professors who will be looking forward to the aid thus promised? How many defenses of and excuses for monopoly will these annuities purchase?

When Mr. Carnegie was simply a successful manufacturer his donations lacked the poison which they now contain. Today he is, next to Rockefeller, the greatest beneficiary of the trust system. Many have opposed his gifts to libraries but the fact that the cities have to keep up the libraries and the further fact that the benefit to each person is too small to calculate—these reasons have led to the general acceptance of his libraries, but in the case of the fund for the aid of indigent professors the natural and inevitable tendency will be to suppress the discussion of the

trust principle and trust methods just where they should be most thoroughly investigated.

Now, if Mr. Carnegie will provide an annuity for needy editors, another for aged ministers and still another for superannuated congressmen, senators and politicians, he will have the batteries pretty effectually silenced, and he could establish all these funds without exhausting the sum which he is drawing from the public by the elimination of competition. If he wants to return to society the money he has drawn from it let him invest his money in government bonds and then surrender the bonds for cancellation. The people would then be benefitted in proportion as they pay taxes. Or, if he wants to leave a monument, let him build an air-line railroad from ocean to ocean, with branches to the main distributing centers and give it to the government. Such a gift would yield an annual return to aid the revenues and would regulate rates more effectively than any rate law.

Under just laws Mr. Carnegie could never have accumulated his enormous fortune and it is adding insult to injury to so distribute it as to prevent the reform of the "system."

#### "THE POOR WERE RIGHT"

Thoughtful observers of present-day conditions may be interested in reading an extract from "The History of England from the year 1830 to the year 1870." The author of this work was William Nassau Molesworth, M. A., Vicar of Scotland, Rochdale. One portion of this work is devoted to "The reception of the reform bill." A Commoner reader asks that these extracts be reproduced:

"The plan thus brought forward was received by the radical party with delight, by the whigs with doubt, by the Tories with terror. It surprised all; for though it did not come up to the wishes of the radicals—who desired the ballot, more frequent parliaments, and universal suffrage—it surpassed the expectations of all parties. By the great body of the people it was hailed with enthusiasm. From the moment of its first announcement they seemed to forget all the other measures which had been prayed for in their petition, and adopted the cry of 'The bill, the whole bill, and nothing but the bill,' which they sustained under all the changes and vicissitudes it underwent, till it finally became the law of the land. On the other hand, the higher and better educated classes generally regarded the measure with great alarm, as the commencement of the overthrow of all the established institutions of the country. They had not forgotten that, under the first French revolution, the landed proprietors had been stripped of their property and driven into exile or put to death; and they dreaded that what they regarded as similar beginnings would lead to similar results.

"It may seem strange that a change, which all men now admit to have been a great and necessary improvement, should have been resisted by the wealthy and educated few, and carried mainly through the exertions of the poor and uneducated multitude; but there is really nothing very surprising in this circumstance. The same may be said of almost every great improvement that has been effected in this or any other country. The leaders of the movement have usually been men of rank and intelligence, and there have been found amongst their followers many men of liberal and highly cultivated minds—nay, sometimes, whole classes of such persons, on whom the existing abuses have pressed with unfair severity, may have joined them; yet as a general rule, the rank and file of the army of progress has been composed of the classes which constituted the chief strength of the reform party. But perhaps this truth was never more strikingly exemplified than in the instance now before us; for if we would put our hands on the men who brought the reform struggle to its triumphant conclusion, we must not seek them in the ministry, in the leading bankers, manufacturers, and tradesmen, who in various parts of the kingdom petitioned for reform, but in the London mob, in the two or three hundred thousand members of the Birmingham political union, in the determination of the great mass of the people in all parts of the kingdom, to march on London at the first signal given by their leaders; and if, on the other hand, we are asked to put our hands on the quarters from which the most formidable and pertinacious resistance to the bill proceeded, we must fix on the court, the clergy, the two universities, the inns of court, and the other ancient seats of learning. The true explanation of this seeming paradox is, that in political questions the belly is generally much more logical than the head. They who are well off deprecate change, because, if it does not bring with it peril to their

fortune and position, it at least renders necessary efforts for the preservation of the one or the other, and that often of a character to which they are unaccustomed, and which perhaps they are unable or unwilling to put forth. But truth and right must ultimately prevail. The resistance thus offered may indeed defer the dreaded change, but can not prevent its advent, and is certain to render it more violent when at last it does come. On the other hand, the very poor are the first to feel the evils which result from a vicious state of things, and their demand for the remedy, is sure to cause its production, which they, guided by a blind but sure instinct, readily recognize and earnestly demand. And this is perhaps the true explanation of the old maxim, "Vox populi, vox Dei;" a maxim which certainly rests on a foundation of facts very far from contemptible. It is not, of course, meant to be asserted that everything the people clamor for ought to be granted; but it is a truth, confirmed in each case by the verdict of posterity, that they have almost invariably been right in their demands when they have generally and persistently supported any measure of alleged improvement. The opinion of the rabble, as they are sometimes called, is by no means to be despised; for it has often proved to be more correct than the judgment of men who have enjoyed a high reputation for statesmanship. Unquestionably, in the reform struggle the mob was right, and their learned, wealthy, and aristocratic opponents altogether mistaken."

#### A GROWING CAUSE

The New York Weekly Post, which has been a little slow to join in the attack against the trusts, has at last come out with an editorial on "The Man Behind the Octopus." The Post insists upon the enforcement of the criminal clause of the Sherman law—the position taken by The Commoner months ago. The Post even goes so far as to ask why the gentleman who is connected with the illegal Northern Securities company has not been fined and imprisoned, and repeats the inquiry in regard to the head of the beef trust and the head of the Standard Oil trust. The Post says:

Until the law smites in their persons a few of these gentlemen, who sustain our churches, adorn our clubs, and promote our philanthropies, the talk of controlling the trusts as such is the wildest unreason or the most patent hypocrisy. Nobody likes to be imprisoned. The most formidable deterrent lies at our hand, and we are too easy-going to use it; and until a fearless enforcement of the present laws lands a few pillars of society behind the bars, all executive excursions and alarms against the trusts will recall that King of France whose twenty thousand men came down the hill and passed into nursery mythology.

Good for The Post! The Commoner welcomes The Post to this very rational and patriotic position. Its tardiness in coming will be overlooked if with the zeal of a new convert it will continue its advocacy of the enforcement of the criminal law against the trust magnates.

#### THE TIMIDITY OF CAPITAL

Mr. J. J. Dickinson, writing in the Saturday Evening Post, calls attention to the timidity of capitalists in testifying against the trusts. He gives several instances to show that even men who have been driven out of business by trust methods have been afraid to make known what they have suffered lest they be made the victims of further wrath. Mr. Dickinson's article presents a new phase of the subject and illustrates the difficulties that lie in the path of those who attempt to prosecute the trusts, but it also illustrates the necessity for heroic treatment.

The trusts are to the busy thoroughfares of commerce what the highwayman is to the lonely road, or what the pirate used to be to the high seas. As it requires physical courage to deal with the highwayman and the pirate so it requires moral courage to deal with private monopolies. And we need just now a public sentiment that will cultivate moral courage in our business men. Of course there is risk but is it not worth some risk to save the business world from the evils of the trusts?

How can evidence be secured for the conviction of the great violators of the law unless those who suffer give testimony? The public, too, should support those who show a willingness to fight the trusts and thus reduce the sacrifice to a minimum. No one is so humble that he may not have a part in the restoration of the era of industrial independence.